

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|---|--|
| Reviewer Name: | Email: |
| Date Manuscript Received: 15/05/2016 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 16/05/2016 |
| Manuscript Title: ETHICS CODES OF THE HUNGARIAN TOP 200 | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 05151/16 | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The title is expressive and raises awareness- | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The abstract is an understandable summary of the paper. | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Thera are several non-English expressions and some sentence structure problems. | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The content of the study and the used methods are in harmony with aims of the paper. The depth of discussion is proper. | |
| 5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Conclusion is appropriate and it | |
| 6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The list of references is correct, includes relevant sources. The style of in-text citation is changing, unification is necessary. | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The content and message of the paper is understandable; the depth of the research is proper. A grammar review is highly recommended for improving the non-English expressions. It is also necessary to check the breakings: some spaces and commas are missing/unnecessary. There are various styles for in-text citation in case of more authors.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is recommended for publication after the grammar refinement.

